In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al   Examiner: Negussie WORKU
Serial No.: 10/787,306   Group Art Unit: 2625
Filed: February 27, 2004   Attorney Docket: 27459
Office Action Mailing Date: December 3, 2008

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 43 are in this Application. Claims 34 -41 and 43 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 – 15, 18 – 32 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1 and 42 have been amended herewith.

Amendments To The Claims

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1 – 15, 18 – 32 and 42 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Hardy et al, US 5,917,896.

The present claims relate to the control of content information being sent by fax through reconstruction of the fax signal into a graphic so as to reproduce the content and then reviewing the content. Claims 1 and 42 have been amended to clarify that it is the content of the fax which is reconstructed in the graphic and which is analyzed.

Hardy teaches graphical monitoring of the fax traffic. However Hardy – see column 4 lines 20 – 35 creates a display of the *received baseband constellation plot*. Thus Hardy, although it is true that he monitors fax traffic using a graphic display, does not either reproduce or monitor *the content*.

Thus claim 1 is believed to be novel and inventive since there is no suggestion in Hardy to monitor the *content of the fax*, certainly not to *reproduce* the content of the fax, and certainly not to *reproduce* the *content graphically* for the purpose of *monitoring the content*. All that Hardy monitors graphically is *the received baseband constellation plot*. The received baseband constellation plot *cannot* reveal the content.

Furthermore, the Examiner's rejection of claim 4 is believed to be overcome for the same reason. Since the received baseband constellation plot cannot include

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al   Examiner: Negussie WORKU
Serial No.: 10/787,306   Group Art Unit: 2625
Filed: February 27, 2004   Attorney Docket: 27459
Office Action Mailing Date: December 3, 2008

any content, it does not include characters and therefore there is not much point in carrying out optical character recognition on it. After all, what use is optical character recognition on a constellation plot? Note that a constellation plot is a kind of a graph. There is nothing in the Examiner's cited passage of col. 4 lines 39 – 51 of Hardy to suggest anything different and no reason why controller 59 would have any characters on which to carry out optical character recognition.

In addition, claim 6 is believed to be novel and inventive since Hardy never decodes key phrases or key words from the fax message, contrary to what the Examiner claims. Examiner points to reference numeral 75 in Fig. 2 as indicating the controller and refers to determining the source of the fax. However the source of the fax is usually a number, that is a telephone number, and the source of a fax is thus not a *keyword*. Applicant further points out that the controller in Fig. 2 is given reference numeral 49 and that reference numeral 75, apparently applying to a rectangle within the controller, is not discussed at any point in the text.

Applicant therefore concludes that claim 1 is novel and inventive. The same amendments have been made to claim 42 so that it too is rendered novel and inventive. The remaining claims are believed to be allowable as being dependent on allowable main claims, although claims 4 and 6 at least are believed to be allowable in their own right.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 – 33 and 42 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: March 31, 2009
Enclosure:
☐   Petition for Extension (One Month)